REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

It is noted that the 2/22/05 Office Action was mailed to the undersigned counsel's prior address. It is noted that a change of address was previously submitted in this matter to update the mailing address. For ease of processing a second Change of Address is submitted herewith.

The 2/22/05 Office Action rejected the previously pending claims 1-3, 5-21 and 38-44 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,499,052 (Hoang). Previously pending claim 4 was rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Hoang in view of Shi.

In response to the 2/22/05 Office Action, the above amendments to the claims are provided. The above amendment cancel claims 1-22, leaving claims 38-44 pending in this case. Claims 38, 39 and 44 have been amended to improve the form of the claims. The cancellation of the claims 1-22 is done to expedite prosecution of claims 38-44, but it should be emphasized that this cancellation of claims 1-22 is done without prejudice to later prosecution via a continuation application or other means. Indeed, it is respectfully that claims 1-22 do not appear to be anticipated or rendered obvious by Hoang. However, to focus the discussion on elements claims 38-44, and to narrow the issues for briefing if an appeal is necessary, claims 1-22 have been canceled.

Rejection of Claims 38-44:

The 2/22/05 Office Action specifically refers to three different areas of Hoang in rejecting claim 38. It is respectfully submitted that the undersigned has carefully reviewed these three areas of text from Hoang, as well as, the other teaching of Hoang, and as explained in more detail below found that Hoang fails to teach a number of elements recited in claim 38.

Hoang teaches a system where a local commerce site references remote commerce websites. The flow chart shown in Fig. 3 of Hoang provides a detailed description an embodiment of Hoang, which is discussed, in part, at Hoang at col. 9, lines 35-67. Hoang teaches a system where a user request is initially received at 310 or 320 (Hoang, Fig. 3) cookie information is retrieved from a cookie database 250. The client request can be either intercepted and dealt with locally (see elements 330 and 334 of Hoang, Fig. 3), or the client request can be

Atty Docket No.: SCHB-1600

sent to a remote merchant site via network B, element 340 of Hoang Fig. 3. When the client request is sent to the remote merchant site, and a response 350 from the remote merchant site is then provided via the network B, element 340 of Hoang Fig. 3, the response from the merchant site is transformed 352 and the merchant cookie information is stripped 362 from the response and stored 372 in the cookie database 250. After the cookie information has been stripped from the transformed response the transformed and stripped merchant response is transmitted 376 to the user via network A.

It is respectfully submitted that the above operation Hoang is very different than the operation recited in pending claim 38. For example, claim 38 recites, in part:

> providing a central domain server, wherein a configuration file resides on the central domain server, and the configuration file contains a list of cookie fields that may be read, or written to, and identifies whether a particular application has read access or write access, to a field of a cookie file . . . .

By providing a configuration list on a central domain server which controls whether a particular application has read or write access to a field in a cookie file, the method of claim 38 provides for enhanced security in that a particular application can only read information that it is authorized to view, and further the possibility of data in a cookie field being altered, by an application which should not have write access to a field is eliminated, because it is the configuration file which resides on the central domain server which determines whether an application has access to particular cookie field. In contrast, the teaching of Hoang does not appear to provide for any restriction over the cookie fields, in the sense that it appears that Hoang provides for merely storing and retrieving cookie information from the cookie database 250. However, if for example, a remote merchant site (152, 154 and 156 of Fig. 1 of Hoang) were to add information to a particular field of a cookie, then it appears that the Hoang method would provide for simply storing the cookie field information in the database 250, but the none of the elements of Hoang appear to provide any suggestion the remote merchant cites should be restricted in terms of read or write access to a cookie field. In contrast, with Hoang, the method of claim 38 provides for a central configuration file which controls access to cookie fields, and where changes in the external applications will not, in and of themselves, alter the content of the configuration file.

Claim 38 also recites in part:

"wherein the first application interface library determines whether the first application user event data is a first type of event data which requires a change to a field in a cookie file to provide real time communication to other applications of the system, and the first application interface library determines whether the user event data is a second type of user event data which does not require real time communication to other applications of the system;

"using a cookie access library to update a change in a field in the cookie file where the first application user event data is determined to be a first type of user event data;

"where a first application user event data is determined to be a second type of user event data transmitting the user event data through message queuing middleware . . . ."

It is respectfully submitted that the above quoted elements of claim 38 further recite additional operations which are very different than the teaching of Hoang. For example, in claim 38 the first application is provided with a first application interface library which determines if event data generated by the first application is a type of data which should be transmitted real time through a cookie field, or if the data is a type of data which need not be transmitted to other applications real time, and can be transmitted to other applications via message queuing middleware. In Hoang, there appears to be very little if any discussion regarding control over the communication between various applications, such as for example the various remote merchant sites 152, 154 and 156 shown in Fig. 2 of Hoang. Indeed, it appears that there is no queuing middleware in Hoang for transmitting event data from one remote merchant site to a second remote merchant site. Further, given that Hoang does not provide for message queuing middleware, it clearly does not provide any suggestion for making a determination as to whether application event data should be transmitted to applications via a cookie field or via message queuing middleware.

In light of the above discussion, it is respectfully submitted that claim 38 is not disclosed or suggested by the Hoang reference. Further, it is respectfully submitted that each of the remaining dependent claims are patentable over Hoang for at least the same reasons as claim 38. In addition to the elements recited by the base independent claim 38, it should be noted that each of the dependent claims further recite additional significant limitations.

For example, claim 44 which is dependent claim from claim 38, with intervening claims 39 and 43, requires pushing information from the configuration file through the message delivering middleware to the application libraries of different applications, and that the pushed

information controls the operation of the application interface libraries. This type of operation offers important advantages over Hoang, in that it allows for a change in the configuration file to be propagated through the middleware to the application libraries for each of the applications, rather than requiring discretely accessing and changing each of the applications. Thus, for this additional reason, it is further submitted that claim 44 is patentable over Hoang.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the pending claims and a notice of allowance are respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to our Deposit Account No. 50-1703, under Order No. SCHB-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated:_____April 5 , 2005_____   By:_____
                                        Brian J. Keating
                                        Reg. No. 39,520

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Atty Docket No.: SCHB-1600